

# New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1919.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Oden Held, President; G. Verner Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Held, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 251 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, TRINAM 2000.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, including Postage:**

IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA	
	One Year
Daily and Sunday	\$10.00
Daily only	8.00
Sunday only	2.00
Sunday only, Canada	2.50

**FOREIGN RATES:**

	One Year
Daily and Sunday	\$24.00
Daily only	18.00
Sunday only	6.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

**GUARANTEE**  
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon receipt. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

**MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS**  
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it, or any other source credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein. All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

## Isn't and Never Was

Mr. Taft, as the public is aware, is the bellwether of "The League to Enforce Peace." This organization, it will be recalled, once laid great emphasis on the penultimate word of its name. The central thought of its propaganda was that a definite big stick should be put in pickle for peace disturbers.

It trumpeted it would not be satisfied with a mushy reiteration of pious aspirations. William Howard did not propose to be fooled by such old stuff. He wanted a sanction, a sanction with teeth, a horned, two-fisted sanction. One could almost hear the tramp of the international army and the thunder of the international fleet.

But Mr. Taft is a cheerful man, an incorrigible optimist, a Mark Tapley never long displeased. He cannot hold himself to a mood of dissatisfaction. On second thoughts the political result in 1912 was not so bad—Utah and Vermont are both excellent states.

So, when the covenant was born, sans sanction, he forgot all about the sanction and swallowed the project whole, saying he liked the taste of it. Indeed, he has since been busy cauterizing away the buttons above the brow of the covenant that might grow into horns.

At last accounts he was still urging the amendments that no league action be permitted without unanimous consent and that any member should be allowed to withdraw at will. Thus he would have a quiling party, not a league to enforce peace. The rules of the gathering would be that not even a thimble could tap any one, unless every one, including the proposed victim, consented.

But there is another set of peace leaguers, gathered in an organization called "The League of Free Nations Association," who are less inclined to accept paste for diamonds. This society, representing some of our foremost intelligentsia, has been holding weekly meetings and fathers a series of amendments which have been carried to Paris. The most important is that national representatives at the world council shall not be appointed by governments, but be elected by the peoples of the constituent nations.

Originally this organization held it essential that the delegates so elected should have legislative power and that non-self-governing territories should have free trade, but it apparently is now willing to drop these items, provided it is made easier for Germany and Russia to join the league.

The London Nation is an organ in Great Britain of those who want league delegates elected and not appointed. It quotes with scorn that part of the President's speech at Boston wherein he said that the base of the league must be the peoples, not the governments, of the world. It points out that the high contracting parties of the covenant are not the Peoples, but these same suspect Governments. If a delegate does not do as his government directs he will come home—the delegate will be merely an ambassador bound to obey orders.

The London Nation thus can see in the plan nothing but a scheme for ambassadors to meet in one place instead of being scattered about as now. "Every democratic organization in the political and industrial world ought without delay," says The Nation, "make a concerted and vigorous effort to rescue the idea of a League of Peoples from this body of death."

The covenant, as first published, contained phrases and ambiguities that laid foundations for claims impinging on national sovereignty. It threw the door open to disputes as to whether or not the league members were or were not required to do specified things, and thus dedicated league meetings to quarrelling, crimination and recrimination. These

defects are now admitted and there is promise of their correction. But far more fundamental is criticism, such as is made by The London Nation.

A league to preserve peace? It isn't and never was.

## The Right Way With the Germans

Marshal Foch is a model negotiator. Clause 16 of the armistice with Germany provided: "The Allies shall have free access to the territories evacuated by the Germans on their eastern frontier, either through Danzig or by the Vistula, in order to convey supplies to the populations of those territories and for the purpose of maintaining order."

With a view to maintaining order in Poland and strengthening its defence against the Bolsheviks the peace conference decided some time ago to transfer to Warsaw General Haller's Polish divisions, which had fought in France under Foch. When it was announced that they would go by way of Danzig the German Provisional Government became violently excited and the German press charged the Allies with complicity in a Polish plot to take forcible possession of Danzig.

Germany demurred at allowing Haller's troops to use the Vistula route and suggested other disembarkation points—among them Königsberg, Stettin and Memel. So Haller's start was again delayed. Finally the problem of choosing a route was turned over to Marshal Foch, who summoned Erzberger to Spa to explain an obvious German failure to live up to the conditions of the armistice.

Foch's powers of persuasion are great. At his instance Erzberger not only withdrew the German government's objection to the use of Danzig by Haller's forces, but also agreed to open additional Baltic ports for their benefit. Germany, moreover, promised to transport some of the Polish soldiers in France overland from Coblenz to the Polish frontier.

In this transaction there is a moral for the conference. Germany is trying to play on its fears and self-distrust. The threat is continually made that if the peace terms are so-and-so the provisional government will decline to sign them and will hand power over to the Reils, as Count Karolyi's Hungarian government did. This bluster seems to have had a paralyzing effect at Paris. But the Danzig incident shows that the Germans themselves have little faith in their threats. They have, in fact, neither the will nor the resources to oppose Allied demands presented to them with an air of authority and a proper amount of firmness.

## Sea Power in the War

Admiral Jellicoe's book, "The Grand Fleet, 1914-1916," disposes of the theory that Allied sea power won the war. It contributed, of course, in a very great measure to the success of the Allied armies. By enforcing the blockade of Germany and securing the free movement of British, Canadian, Australian, American, East Indian and African troops to the continent of Europe, as well as the supplies needed to equip and support them, it enabled the Allies to win the war on land. Germany was strong on land and the Allies for a long time were weak there. But on the sea, where Germany was weak—except in submarines—and the Allies were strong, no decision was reached. The Allied fleets failed to force the Dardanelles, and failed also to destroy the enemy High Sea surface fleet.

Admiral Jellicoe's policy was essentially cautious. Technically offensive, it was really defensive. In his book he gives the reasons—hitherto obscure—which led him to play primarily for safety. He concedes to the German fleet certain points of superiority, of which its leaders do not seem to have been fully aware. He says that in 1914 and 1915 the Germans had at least an even chance in the open. Their capital ships were faster than he thought them to be and were much better protected against shell fire and torpedoes. The Germans had a superior fire control, more destroyers, a better torpedo attack and a delayed fuse shell which far outclassed the corresponding British projectile.

Admiral Jellicoe's preoccupation was to take no serious risks. Defending his strategy in the critical phase of the Battle of Jutland, he says:

"A third consideration that was present in my mind was the necessity for not leaving anything to chance in a fleet action, because our fleet was the one and only factor that was vital to the existence of the empire, as, indeed, to the Allied cause. We had no reserve, outside the Battle Fleet, which could in any way take its place should disaster befall it, or even should its margin of superiority over the enemy be eliminated."

Mr. Arthur H. Pollen and other naval critics have challenged the soundness of Jellicoe's judgment in turning away from the German fleet on the evening of May 31 when he saw an enemy torpedo attack developing. By doing so he lost touch with the High Sea fleet and the opportunity to turn an indecisive action into a momentous victory. But in avoiding closer contact and the risks of night fighting Jellicoe was only carrying out a fixed purpose. His carefully matured plans did not permit him to do anything else. Disclosures made since the end of the war strengthen the supposition that by closing in he might have come near finishing the Germans. But he didn't know at the time how severely the High Sea fleet had been punished.

Jutland failed to alter the military situation. But Admiral Jellicoe was always more concerned about maintaining his own strength than about breaking the enemy's. And in this he concurred with the policy of the British Admiralty, set forth in January, 1915, by Lord Fisher. The latter wrote the following memorandum for Premier Asquith at the time a

naval attack on the Dardanelles forts was first under consideration:

"The sole justification of bombardments and attacks by the fleet on fortified places, such as the Dardanelles, is to force a decision at sea. As long as the German High Sea Fleet possesses its present strength and splendid gunnery efficiency, so long is it imperative that no operation be undertaken by the British fleet calculated to impair its superiority, which is none too great in view of the heavy losses already experienced in ships and men, which latter cannot be filled in the period of the war, in which the navy differs materially from the army. Even the older ships should not be risked, for they cannot be lost without losing men, and they form the only reserve behind the Great Fleet."

Admiral Jellicoe presents a logical and candid defence of this conservative programme. Whether he really justifies it will remain a matter of opinion. But in offering it he puts a quietus on the contention that Allied sea power was used, or intended to be used, except as a secondary, offensive-defensive weapon. The Allied fleets were of great value. But the Allied armies won the war.

## Our Wild Young World

Was there ever, we wonder, a time in the world when the old stuff looked so welcome and tasty as now? When the walls of Jericho went flat there must have been an exceeding bad moment for radicals and conservatives alike; and we don't suppose Rome was any too cheerful while Pope Leo I was debating with Attila and persuading him not to sack the town. But, after all, those were days of perennial wars, and it was a dull year when somebody's town was not being razed. But our war came out of the most peaceful sky—at a moment when our swords had been beaten into Ford cars and most people hardly knew how to shoot a gun, let alone fight a nation. Wherefore our shock and surprise must rank high, whether we take Lincoln Stephens or The New Republic seriously or not.

What we suspect is that in such an hour most radicals develop unsuspected affection for the old, familiar ways. Of course, there are the extremists who become more and more excited as the newest new unrolls. Callow maidens of Greenwich Village swoon with rapture at the thought of a soviet—the dear, wild thing! But we are speaking of the bulk of radicals and liberals and progressives and so on—which most Americans, conservatives included, have always liked to fancy they were. And these are plainly glad enough of the old, old stuff.

Take the circus, for instance. It is doing the biggest business ever. Somehow perhaps because it is the biggest circus ever. But more, we suspect, because of its oldest stuff, peanuts and elephants and sawdust ring, than which nothing sings warmer in the heart of old ways and days and life as we have always lived it.

Here is the philosophic explanation of Bolshevism, we suppose. The world has to swing wild once in a while, or it would crystallize into a piece of very dull and classic statuary. But most of us would prefer not to see it, even in part, behave as now, strikingly like that famous Nude Descending a Staircase. And so many of us, radicals all, feel a temporary leaning the other way, as if to balance the swoops of our wild young earth with the mighty weight of our sober old heads.

Will we stick thus leaning haughtily backward and be wry-necked conservatives for the rest of our days? The guess is not. The truly conservative will remain conservative as they always were—just as the crazy-coots will continue being crazy and cheer for the shocking because it is shocking. Both kinds will revert to type when the world settles down. The radicals will once again look upon the new cheerfully and hopefully, and chuckle at the old fogies good-humoredly. And the old fogies will indulgently pat the hand of radicalism. They will even be able to smile cheerfully in discussing those crazy hours when the atavistic earth forgot its orbit and reverted to the parabola of its comet days.

## Through the Torn Veil

One Mr. Paul Scott Mowrer, writing for the front page of The New York Globe under a Paris date line, begins his vasty revelations in this arresting fashion:

"I am at last able to tear aside the veil of doubts, contradictions and misunderstandings which for several weeks have obscured the progress of the peace negotiations."

What follows is not especially different from other trumpet calls blown by the little group of Wilsonian newspaper correspondents at the peace conference. Through the torn veil, then, it is revealed that the final crisis is approaching. Heroic measures may be necessary. Mr. Wilson may appeal to the world.

But the veil reveals too much. Suddenly we come upon this immortal and unconscious picture of just exactly what Mr. Mowrer's conception of the great American stand against the world really was:

"The United States was accused of desiring to profit by the power it obtained during the war at Europe's expense to develop its world trade. It was also beginning to be accused of being more pro-German than it probably was."

## Harbingers of Spring

(From The Chicago News)  
Not even the aviator who first flies across the Atlantic will be prouder than the back lot gardener who raises the first radish in his neighborhood.

## Praise Indeed

(From The Philadelphia Public Ledger)  
For a place that a year ago was only "an Atlantic port," New York seems to be doing quite a thriving business.

## The Conning Tower

**A Spring Song**  
The early sun upon the hill  
Reminds me with the whippoorwill  
That Spring is coming.  
At eve the moon and stars may hear  
Sweet Robin's song for his lady's ear.  
The bluebird softly humming,  
And yet our maidens fond and true  
Are many miles across the blue—  
Is man a patient waiter?

The Jeanes of France cast loving eyes;  
And many a Jack, as I surmise,  
Will turn a bounding traitor.

As warmer rays melt Winter's frost,  
So Wisdom's slaying voice is lost  
'Gainst Cupid's sweet endeavor,  
And casting care with Winter's air,  
Each Romeo his heart will swear  
To Juliet forever.

How with the budding of the rose,  
Now lovelier each lady grows;  
And who is not affected?  
What is an honest lad to do  
When Spring sees two bright eyes and blue,  
And what may be expected?

We whipped the base and scheming Hun  
And set the Kaiser on the run;  
But Spring has got us hoisted;  
And many a lad—oh, prank of Fate!—  
Who fought the world to liberate,  
Will find his heart arrested.

The moral of my song is this:  
Oh, Wilson, Baker, Pershing, Bliss,  
Your task is still gigantic;  
We fear not Kaiser, czar or king,  
But why take chances on the Spring  
When there's a free Atlantic?

A. P. O. 706, A. E. W. ARTHUR MORRIS.  
Eddie the proofboy is working on his forthcoming Tower, but objects to reading the papers, which, in our first lesson, we told him was a necessary daily duty. "It takes too much time," he says; and we are not sure that he is wrong. Sometimes we frivel away three or four hours on the papers and winnow one short paragraph. Gazing across the window at the World Building is the most productive way of acquiring what the layman calls inspiration.

"To your list of Sub-Solar Novelties," writes Ambrose Glutz, "add the Hat which you slip into the patented holder under your seat at the theatre and which you believe is there throughout the performance. When you reach for it as the curtain is about to fall you are amazed to discover that it has changed into a gritty shoe containing a large quantity of foot."

## We'll Say He Will

Sir: The typical American held back considerably on the First, Second, Third and Fourth Liberty loans because he was sure there would be at least five more.

In gratitude for the finality of the Victory Loan he will subscribe all that he saved out and much, much more. He will subscribe his all. Or will he? GUS.

"When I say 'very' I don't mean what you mean," writes Mr. Edwin W. Sanborn. "You visualize, not to say envisage, the archaic English use of the word, whereas in our usage it has experienced a change of heart similar to that of the word 'quite.' When an Englishman says he has had quite enough tea, he means that the temperature and capacity of his interior will not admit of another spoonful. When we say a show is quite good, we mean pretty good, fairly good. Quite good means 68 on a scale of 100; very good about 80. A good deal depends on the intonation." We quarrel; to us, quite good is 40 on a scale of 100; very good about 41; and good is between 30 and 100.

## Gotham Gleanings

—W. Hohenzollern sawed wood last week.

—Looks like the 77th Div. would not parade.

—The Authors' League will dine to-morrow eve'g.

—Harry Taber was a pleasant caller Wednes., also Fred Kelly.

—Newt Baker is going to Paris this week, taking Stanley King along.

—Ray Van Buren is back from France, where he was one of the 27th's boys.

—The smiling face of Miss Judy Farnham was seen horseback riding in the Park Thurs.

—Charley Riegelman the w. k. atty at law got down from Pinehurst to-day and is back at work.

—Ollie Newman of Chaumont, Fr., and Washington, D. C., passed through Gotham Thurs. en route from Brest to Washington. Ollie is an Iowa boy who made good in the Army.

—The newspaper men who didn't go to war are going to give a banquet Apr. 26 at the Commodore to those who did, and Frank Pope says will we say something about it. O. K., Frank.

The Secretary of War, bless his tobacco heart, is the best S. of W. we ever served under; and he has our respect and affection. But we wish he wouldn't begin a statement with "My attention has been called to a newspaper account." To our bigoted notion, it takes the pose that the writer of it is so engrossed in weightier matters that he never reads the papers. It is used most commonly by men who subscribe to press clipping bureaus.

"We are taking the liberty of addressing this letter," writes Mr. Jerome A. Myers, Chief, Outdoor Speakers, "to a selected list of men whom we feel would be a credit to the organization." And whom no doubt will be.

Franklin Pierce was our Fourteenth President. Note that the initials F. P. stand for both Franklin Pierce and Fourteenth President. Note also that there are fourteen letters in the name of Franklin Pierce.—From David M. Roth's Memory Course.

We never shall be able to remember that. P. P. A.



## Queer Apostles of Loyalty

An analysis of Creel's defence of the Nonpartisan League

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: In the course of an article in the March number of "Everybody's Magazine," entitled "Our 'Aliens': Were They Loyal or Disloyal?" Mr. George Creel, chairman of the Committee on Public Information, comes to the defence of the Nonpartisan League and makes a virulent attack upon the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety.

"The Committee on Public Information," he says, "formed to fight disaffection, attacked the Northwest at once, . . . and the one organization that we wanted most particularly to reach was the Nonpartisan League, for it had a membership that covered the Dakotas, Minnesota, Montana and Idaho, and, more than any other, was impregnated with the lie about a 'rich man's war.'"

## "A Rich Man's War"

Thoroughly "impregnated with the lie" the league certainly was, thanks to its leaders, and particularly A. C. Townley, its president, who had persistently rung the changes on the "rich man's war." It is consequently not a little startling to be informed by Mr. Creel that "the leaders of the Nonpartisan League came personally to Washington to ask the government to commence a campaign of patriotic education, and Minnesota was selected for the initiation of the drive."

But, alas! "Our speakers," says Mr. Creel, "upon arrival in Minnesota were informed by the State Public Safety Commission that they would not be allowed to address any meeting arranged by the Nonpartisan League or under its auspices. There was no quarrel with the men we sent, for the commission asked permission to use them in its own speaking campaign. . . . Even if the Nonpartisan League were disloyal, then the more reason why our speakers should smash at its membership with the truth. But the State Public Safety Commission stood like iron, barred our speakers absolutely and inaugurated a campaign of terrorism that had its ugly reflex among the farmers and labor unions in every state."

## Mr. Creel's Error of Fact

Even a chairman of a committee on public information may fall into errors of fact, and in all this the chairman is misinformed. There was no "campaign of terrorism." As for Mr. Creel's speakers, Governor Burnquist, who, as chairman of the State Public Safety Commission, was in a position to know the facts, and who is an unimpeachable witness, in a speech delivered in St. Paul on March 7 has made the following explicit statement:

"With the exception of a request from Mr. Creel that Joseph Gilbert, who was the Minnesota manager of the Nonpartisan League, be permitted to speak at the great state patriotic rally held in this auditorium in November of 1917 to offset in a measure the La Follette speech at the Nonpartisan convention held here earlier in the year, so far as we know the only person sent to the state by Mr. Creel as a speaker for the league was Dixon C. Williams, of Chicago. After his arrival in Minnesota this last named gentleman discovered the disloyal character of the leaders of the Nonpartisan League and voluntarily stated to the secretary of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety that he would not speak under the auspices of the league, but would be glad to speak under the direction of the commission."

So much for Mr. Creel's public mis-

FORE!!!

## Evolution Not Bolshevism

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your esteemed paper is generally so sound on social questions that it comes as a shock to see your editorial on "The Nature of Bolshevism," identifying that cult with the perfectly good evolutionary movement for the democratization of individual industries, and one which, in fact, has made considerable advance in this country.

You cannot fail to be familiar with the remarkable success attendant upon the experiment at the Filene stores, in Boston, of the rapidly increasing tendency to adopt the teachings of the Canadian Mackenzie King, both of which are far more rational than the shop committee system advocated unofficially by the American Federation of Labor, and which it is expected to limit mainly to considerations of shop discipline. The more legitimate evolutionary movements are probably identified, rightly or wrongly, with Bolshevism, the better for the latter.

That cult now is doing its very best to make the honest workmen of the country believe that their interests lie with it, and to that end are continually representing themselves from the houseposts as "the workers," while nothing in the world could be further from their intention than to work honestly.

It seems to us that the communistic aims of Bolshevism, which do not differ conspicuously from those advanced at one time during the course of the French Revolution, are not especially important to the community at this time. They could be classified with the many other attempts to substitute a priori social structure for the evolutionary one which has been developing since the dawn of history, and which contains premises, seen and unseen, so complicated as to defy critical analysis and wholesale reconstruction. What we are particularly interested in is the means by which they intend to attain their aims.

On Lenin's own statement, no benefit may be expected to accrue for at least three generations; society lying in a state of chaos in the mean time. No one will suffer by this more than the workers. In a state of anarchy the predatory rise to the top everywhere, and the world will interrupt its present rapid course of altruistic evolution in favor of a condition resembling Spain after the expulsion of the Moors.

The alarming element in this whole situation is the extent to which various widely differing social cults are temporarily uniting in the common means of attaining their several ends by violence.

It is very distressing to see and hear evidences of false security based on the idea of the unlikelyhood that the I. W. W. in this country will attain a majority. Where Bolshevism rules to-day it does so by virtue of the force of a small, organized minority in a country always more or less economically unorganized and, at present, totally disorganized.

HAYDEN FAMES.  
New York, March 31, 1919.

## Ultimate Ambitions

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Colonel Watterson sees in the President's league of nations activities that he is looking toward a third term. Permit me to suggest that what Mr. Wilson is really aiming at is to occupy the head of the table at which will assemble the nine men who would practically control the destinies of the world. A mere President! Possibly this may be doing Mr. Wilson an injustice, but it seems to me to be the only theory that can account fully for what he has done and is doing.

New York, March 19, 1919. W. C. C.